DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 624 AC 012 601

TITLE	Southeastern Region Adult Basic Education Staff Development Project. First Year Report, 1969-1970.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	100p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; College Programs; College Students; Graduate Study; Inservice Courses; Instructional Staff; Preservice Education; *Professional Continuing Education; *Regional Programs; Seminars; Special Education Teachers; *Staff Improvement; State Departments of Education; Supervisory Training; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Universities; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Southern Regional Education Board; *Staff Development Project

ABSTRACT

In its first year of operation, the Staff Development Project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) made dramatic quantitative gains in Adult Basic Education (ABE) teacher training throughout the Southeast. The following have been accomplished in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee: 16 institutions of higher education participated in project activities; 13 of these colleges and universities established adult education divisions for the first time; 16 programs leading to master's sixth-year certificates and doctorates were added to six already existing, and 19 additional ones are planned; 29 full-time education faculty were employed by participating institutions; 16 graduate students actively participated in both university program activities and in providing in-service training to local ABE personnel; 61 graduate and undergraduate courses were added, and an additional 33 are planned; 2,971 students enrolled in credit courses offered by six universities on campus, off-campus, and by extension; 7,800 teachers attended courses, institutes, seminars, and workshops; 4,735 teachers and supervisors attended more than 118 seminars and workshops to begin regular in-service training for ABE personnel; 337 ABE classes and programs were visited by college and university staff; teacher trainer were established in two states; cooperative planning teams were instituted in two other states; all states assumed responsibility for developing on-going professional training plans; 400 staff members attended three regional seminars; 17 ABE teachers for the blind or visually handicapped were trained; and a 12 member research panel was established to evaluate the project. (Author/DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FIRST YEAR REPORT
1969 - 1970

SOUTHEASTERN REGION
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

This report was prepared pursuant to grants received by the Southern Regional Education Board from the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under Sections 309b and 309c of the Adult Education Act of 1966. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

FOREWORD

The Southern Regional Education Board has fostered regional cooperation in higher education for 22 years. The Board has extended its regional relationships through this project funded by the U. S. Office of Education under the Adult Education Act of 1966. Traditional ties with higher education and state government have expanded through this activity to include departments of education and many local programs organized to work directly with adult learners.

This imaginative attack on the serious problems of adult illiteracy in the South has achieved great success in only one year. This cooperative approach toward improved training for staff working with adults was begun several years ago by the six state directors of Adult Education in HEW Region IV. SREB gladly joined this effort in order to facilitate the interstate development of cooperative solutions to problems in teaching adults, and new and imaginative programs for staff development.

The Southern Regional Education Board is pleased to present this first-year report. The successes reported are due to the high quality of cooperation among state directors, university participants, local personnel, and the capable project staff at SREB. We look upon this as only the beginning and expect the coming two years to demonstrate additional ways in which cooperative efforts can improve the quality of education that must be provided to undereducated adults in the Southeast.

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
Director of Special Programs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

SUMMARY ix

CHAPTER I. PROJECT HISTORY, DESIGN, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS 3

CHAPTER II. FIRST-YEAR REGIONAL EVALUATION OF THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 33

CHAPTER III. FUTURE ACTIVITIES 63

APPENDIXES 71

Project Staff 73

Office of Education Program Officers 73

Planning Committee 74

Participating Institutions, Staff, and Graduate Students. 75

Regional Seminar Consultants 78

Special Consultants 78

Evaluation Panel 79

Evaluation Panel Interview Assignments 80

Evaluation Instrument. 81

Television Committee 93

Regional Project Publications. 95

PREFACE

There are over five million uneducated or undereducated adults in the Southeast--the highest concentration of functional illiterates in the nation.

Many of these adults are recruited into Adult Basic Education programs to be taught by teachers trained for the traditional public school classroom. Many leave these classes before measurable change is achieved.

This Project is based on the assumption that teaching practices tailored to the needs of the adult illiterate will hold more of the students longer--the emphasis is on training teachers and other professional staff.

Not readily apparent in this first-year report is the Project's comprehensiveness and the planning role assumed by the directors of Adult Education in the six participating states. Although the first year seemed university oriented, the Project's three-year goal is to create three major region-wide teacher-training resources: one, at colleges and universities to provide pre-service and in-service undergraduate and graduate college credit training; two, in all areas of each state to plan and to provide its own in-service training to be available when and as needed; three, within the state departments of education to provide leadership and to coordinate these two major resources.

A further strength of the Project lies in three supplementary activities which draw together the major programs.

The first activity brings institutional staff into local programs as consultants, enabling them to assist in problem solution; importantly this contact influences training curricula toward greater practicality. The second is technical services which provide expertise to solve regional problems; and the third is a regular interchange concerning training questions and solutions in a planned seminar environment.

The Project design allows each state to develop unique programs to serve its needs and to adapt the successes of neighboring states into its own program. Adult Basic Education is often considered a marginal area of educational effort, run by "moonlighters." With trained staff, those misconceptions can be placed under concerted and strenuous attack.

In my experience this is the most comprehensive and thoroughly interrelated staff development project initiated in the Southeast, and it is in the area of education and of the country which needs it most.

Edward T. Brown
Project Director
June, 1970

SUMMARY

In its first year of operation, the Staff Development Project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) made dramatic quantitative gains in Adult Basic Education (ABE) teacher training throughout the Southeast. The following have been accomplished in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina and Tennessee.

. . . 16 institutions of higher education participated in Project activities through course offerings, degree programs, workshops and seminars.

. . . 13 of these, colleges and universities, established adult education divisions for the first time, including one predominantly black institution in each state.

. . . 16 programs leading to master's, sixth-year certificates and doctorates were added to six already existing, a 226 percent increase, and 19 additional ones are planned.

. . . 29 full-time adult education faculty were employed by participating institutions.

. . . 16 graduate students actively participated both in university program activities, and assisted the state departments of education in providing in-service training to local ABE personnel.

. . . 61 graduate and undergraduate courses were added, and an additional 33 planned.

. . . 2,971 students enrolled in credit courses offered on-campus, off-campus and by extension, or through seven two-week institutes held at six universities.

. . . 7,800 teachers, nearly 90 percent of the Southeast's Adult Basic Education staff attended courses, institutes, seminars and workshops, and received supplementary training.

. . . 4,735 teachers and supervisors attended more than 118 seminars and workshops to begin regular in-service training for ABE personnel.

. . . 337 ABE classes and programs were visited by college and university staff, who provided assistance in instruction and material selection.

. . . Teacher trainer teams were established in two of the six states to provide training in selected geographical areas.

. . . Cooperative university, state department of education and local coordinator planning teams to schedule in-service experiences were instituted in two other states.

. . . Responsibility for developing ongoing professional training plans was assumed in all states, either by the Adult Education director or a member of his staff.

. . . 400 local ABE program, state department of education and institutional personnel attended three regional seminars to examine the staff development process and discuss inputs for individual state plans.

. . . 17 teachers of the ABE for the blind or visually handicapped were trained at two specialized institutes.

. . . A 12 member research panel representing a range of academic disciplines and each participating state was established to evaluate the Project.

The Project

These increases were accomplished through the Project's six major activities. Four of these were planned and administered within each state by the state ABE director, in accordance with program needs; each contributed to a comprehensive plan for staff development within the states and built toward regionwide strengths. Two region-based activities supplemented the state-based ones. The six activities were:

1. Higher Education Capabilities which involved at least two institutions in each state to provide pre- and in-service Adult and Adult Basic Education training through courses and graduate degree programs.

2. Continuing Consultant which provided college and university instructors to assist local ABE programs and enabled them to gain experience which would influence their curriculum toward more meaningful training experiences.

3. Local In-Service Capability which facilitated the development of training competencies in local program areas, and assisted supervisors in establishing sequential seminar and workshop programs.

4. State Department of Education In-Service Leadership, which enhanced the role its personnel play in the planning, and utilization of staff development resources available in each state and throughout the region.

5. The Regional Seminar Program which provided an opportunity for state departments of education, institutional and local programs staffs to meet jointly for discussion of issues related to teacher training and professional development.

6. The Technical Services Program which brought to the region technical expertise and specialized materials not available to individual institutions or states.

Regional seminars, in particular, expanded the channels of communication for ABE personnel across the region. The identification of professional roles and discussions of common needs and goals were accomplished at these meetings. Dialogues which developed between state department, university, and local program personnel have led to more general acceptance

of the complementary roles played by each professional group, and, to some extent, increased the willingness to cooperate in reaching common objectives.

Continuing Concerns

During the second year, Kentucky and North Carolina will join the Project.

It is especially important that institutional courses, and in-service experiences more precisely reflect learner needs. While planning groups have been established in some states, their functions should be more clearly indicated. This includes defining the contributing role to be played by local program personnel, and the leadership task of state departments of education.

The planning process itself is in a most undeveloped state and deserves more concentrated attention, leading to coordination of presently random activities into concerted staff development efforts. Finally, a more objective evaluation system for judging the effectiveness of training experiences is needed. These evaluations could improve the mechanisms by which staff are selected for participation in ABE.

It is imperative that quality and depth be added to consolidate the first year's quantitative gains. The next year of Project activity should, hopefully, provide the time and impetus needed to build on the framework already established.

Chapter I

PROJECT HISTORY, DESIGN, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Background

Directors of Adult Basic Education (ABE) in the states of Department of Health, Education and Welfare Region IV (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee) began discussing their program development needs over four years ago. These discussions fostered a sense of unity and underlined the regional nature of many ABE problems. The need for and components of a comprehensive regional plan for professional staff development grew out of these regular interchanges.

In 1965, increased amounts of federal funds became available through the Adult Education Act. These monies expanded state programs and supported a variety of teacher-training institutes, run nationally and regionally. These national and regional ABE institutes had begun to redress the grave lack of trained teachers for illiterate adults, but these experiences had done little in the Southeast but underline the breadth of the region's needs. In addition, three other crucial inadequacies became apparent to the state directors: 1) uncoordinated state planning for both Adult Education (AE) and ABE; 2) untrained or minimally trained local teachers and supervisors working in AE and ABE; and 3) a minimal competency base for AE training, especially at the higher educational and public school levels. Having recognized these regional problems, the state directors sought a remedy for them.

Through the stimulation of the Office of Education's regional program officer, the state directors began to consider a comprehensive plan for increasing the number of bona fide opportunities for staff development in the Southeast. A three-year plan evolved, emphasizing the key role to be played by each state director as both a program administrator and developer. In addition, while the anticipated initial federal commitment was to be substantial, it was expected that state departments of education and higher educational institutions would make cash or in-kind contributions which would increase during each of the three Project years.

Regional support for the Project idea was stimulated by the six state directors and the then regional program officer. Six program facets, providing for a comprehensive approach to regional staff development, were conceived by that group, assisted by the director of continuing education at Florida State University and an educational specialist with the Tennessee Valley Authority in Knoxville.

Through their combined efforts, indications of support were received from staff of the Office of Education, which was particularly impressed by the amount of thought and preplanning which had been given to this total regional effort. Other sections of the country had discussed a similar approach to ABE staff development, but none of their plans were as comprehensive as that of the Southeastern region. The great ABE needs of this area were also taken into account by the Office of Education in the funding decision.

The planning group had originally hoped to establish a nonprofit corporation to administer the proposed Project, but in early 1969, it became evident that a self-formed corporation was unacceptable to the Office of Education and a number of the participating states. Since the planning group felt strongly that the idea for the Project had merit, it then sought to locate an established and experienced regional organization to administer the Project. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was approached and discussions began.

SREB was asked to administer this comprehensive effort because of its history of coordinating activities between higher educational institutions and state governments. Its association with the improvement of predominantly black institutions was also recognized. With SREB guidance, it was felt that a regional theme would be insured, enabling all states to develop comparable AE and ABE programs and making unique professional development facilities in any one state available to all.

Subsequently, SREB agreed to rewrite the proposal and administer the Project. All activities included in that revised document were regional in scope, though a program base was established in each state through the state department of education and its ABE coordinator or director.

As the Project was cooperatively conceived, there were six major activities which would be conducted throughout the region. Four of these, designed to heighten staff development abilities in the individual states, would be planned

and administered by each state director in accordance with his/her individual ABE program needs. The two remaining activities of the Project would be established and directed by Project staff in the SREB office. These activities were devised to provide support services, in-service training, and a forum for the regional interchange of ideas and discussion of common problems for ABE personnel from all six states in the region.

The proposal revisions made by SREB were agreed to by the six state directors. In addition, there were two other significant agreements reached prior to the Project's inception:

1. At least two institutions of higher education were to participate in each state program, one of these being predominantly black and the other predominantly white.
2. State directors of ABE would be responsible for planning and coordinating the four Project activities within their respective states, and SREB would be responsible for reviewing, approving, and evaluating all Project activities to insure a comprehensive state and regional approach.

It was a clear concern of the Office of Education and SREB that meaningful involvement of black institutions be a significant part of Project activity throughout the region. An equal concern was that the Project operate to secure a firm leadership role in staff development activities for the state ABE director.

With these understandings and background, the Project was funded and began operations on June 1, 1969.

The Rationale for and Description of Project Components

The Regional Project approaches the accomplishments of its goals through six complementary activities. While all are regional in scope, four of these are state-based; the other two support and extend efforts in each state and emphasize the Project's regionality. All states were budgeted equal amounts from the Project grant to support the four state-administered activities. The comparability of activity in each state is designed to maximize total Project impact through the following:

1. Direct involvement of state departments of education, their ABE directors, and personnel in professional staff program development and coordination.
2. Contributions of institutions of higher education through courses and programs.
3. Involvement of local ABE personnel in planning pre- and in-service staff training curricula and the development of their ability to plan and conduct short-term in-service seminars and workshops.

The programs operated concurrently in each of the six states are:

1. Higher Education Capabilities Program. This part of the Project is designed to establish or enhance ability of at least two institutions of higher education in

each state to provide pre-service and in-service training to ABE personnel through undergraduate and graduate courses and degree programs.

2. The Continuing Consultant Program. This is an extension of college and university involvement. It facilitates contact between professors and students and local program teachers and coordinators. Through this contact, problems at the classroom level can be cooperatively confronted and, hopefully, solved. Equally as important, these experiences also are expected to help instructors refine courses and programs so they are more relevant to their students' needs.

3. Local In-Service Capability Program. This effort is developing the abilities of personnel in local areas to provide their own in-service training. The institutional staffs provide initial training to local supervisors to help establish them as effective trainers, insuring the availability of in-service opportunities in local areas. Through this program, both short and long seminars, drive-in conferences, workshops, and institutes are being held to train and provide practicums for ABE teachers. Because of the great need for providing teachers with in-service experience, summer institutes were a first-year emphasis and the major initial activity of the first months of the Project.

4. State Department of Education In-Service Leadership Program. This program is augmenting the state depart-

ment staff or in other ways increasing its ability to provide leadership to the planning and utilization of staff development resources available in the state and region. These staff members have the important additional function of coordinating higher educational and local efforts into a statewide, sequential staff development program.

The two regional programs support and extend individual state efforts. These programs are:

1. Regional Seminar Program. This provides an opportunity for state department, institutional, and local program staffs from all six states to meet jointly for discussion of issues related to teacher training and professional development. It has the function of defining common and unique needs and roles played by cooperating groups and, to some extent, facilitates acceptance of their own and each other's roles. The seminars are also an opportunity for the region to examine the planning process and, in some cases, initiate state plans for professional staff development and training.
2. The Technical Services Program. This program is bringing technical expertise from throughout the country to help solve regional and local problems in the higher educational and local ABE programs. At the state level, university expertise is available to local programs; at the regional level, national expertise is available to assist institutional programs. Through this service

support is provided to develop evaluation instruments for ABE teachers and a film for training new ABE teachers and to conduct intensive training seminars on evaluation and planning for state department and university staffs.

These six activities mentioned above have fostered continuing contact between state departments of education, higher educational institutions, and local programs. The Project has generated significant cash or in-kind contributions from each, demonstrating their support.

Seen as a whole, the Project is establishing four distinct, though related, abilities:

1. The ability of states and their institutions of higher education to train teachers through degree programs, courses, or short-term in-service experiences.
2. The ability of institutional staffs to develop training and professional growth programs relevant to ABE professionals, leading to classroom activities geared to student levels and needs.
3. The ability of local program personnel to plan and provide in-service training to its own teaching staff in the areas of orientation, teaching techniques, and student recruitment, placement, evaluation, and retention.

4. The ability of the region to develop and use unique and specialized techniques for training teachers, orienting administrators, and working with specialized or handicapped populations.

These combined activities will produce state and regionally applicable models for pre- and in-service training of local ABE teachers, coordinators, program administrators, and state department of education and institutional staff. In addition, unique state competencies are being made available to the region. These include:

1. In-service programs for training teachers in the use of learning laboratories and individualized instruction materials.
2. Models for developing teacher-trainer teams composed of local ABE teachers, using state department of education and institutional staff as consultants.
3. Films for orienting new teachers to the disadvantaged adult learner.

Finally, the choice of activities and the consistent involvement of state and higher educational institution leadership more firmly roots the Project in the region. The monies allocated SREB by the Office of Education are designed to foster that involvement and lay a basis for continued cooperation and program growth after federal support ceases. Project endeavors also bring to fruition several years of discussion and

planning by state department of education and institutional officials who saw the Southeast's ABE needs and conceived a comprehensive program to address them.

First-Year Activities

State-Based Activities

During the first Project year this cooperative regional endeavor increased the breadth of training opportunities for professionals in ABE. Accomplishments cannot be ranked, because each represents a complementary phase of a total improvement program.

Before the inception of the Project, there were three institutions* in the region with defined graduate programs in Adult Education. Three others offered a limited selection of courses; a total of 18 were available in the Southeast.

Sixteen colleges and universities are now involved in AE, along with the state departments of education, in the six states. Eleven institutions, including six which are predominantly black, have initiated courses and programs for the first time. There are 22 degree and nondegree programs, offering 79 courses, with 23 full- and part-time faculty members and a student population of 1,673 this first year. These course and program gains have advanced the Project goal of making courses available on campus or within driving distance of all ABE teachers.

---

*Florida State University at Tallahassee, the University of Georgia at Athens, and North Carolina State University at Raleigh.

The operating programs mentioned above will be augmented by 52 additional graduate courses. These will be conducted both on- and off-campus.

Equally significant is the regional involvement of predominantly black institutions. Initially, some state department officers, staff members from predominantly white institutions, and local ABE teachers and coordinators, being doubtful that the blacks' contribution would be of the quality desired, were reluctant to invite black institutions to join the Project. In addition, some black institutions invited to participate were skeptical, feeling that it would be difficult to work with the state departments and that they would not be regarded as equals with other higher educational institutions.

One year of activity has shown these black colleges and universities to be effective participants in the Project, a fact which has led to their acceptance by many of the white ABE personnel. On- and off-campus courses conducted by blacks were well-received and relevant to student needs. Staff from these institutions have provided instruction at seminars and workshops in the field and at statewide institutes. Professors and graduate students serve on planning teams for state ABE activities and contribute to regional programs. In addition to sharing the load in each state, the black institutions and their staffs add a needed level of sensitivity to and understanding of the ABE target population in the Southeast.

Cooperative efforts are now also evident between the predominantly black and white colleges and universities.

Activities at both are integrated. With some exceptions, summer institutes and off-campus courses conducted by the 16 institutions in the region tended to enroll not less than 40 percent of the opposite race.

All but one of the 16 participating institutions of higher education have initiated or continued AE/ABE course and degree offerings. There are, however, varying degrees of activism or involvement among the 15. The most active colleges and universities have experienced firm administration support, particularly from deans of colleges of education and department chairmen. These officials have indicated a willingness to continue staff and programs after Project financial support ceases.

Support from regents in two states has been an effective means of stimulating program growth and tying it to overall state educational development plans.

Those institutions moving more slowly or reluctantly into the Project demonstrated:

1. An inability to secure staff soon enough or attract qualified personnel.
2. A reluctance to hire new personnel and a willingness to transfer faculty with limited experience in ABE to the Project.
3. A desire to devote time to planning activities coupled with an unwillingness to act on the plans.
4. A reluctance to be involved with state departments of education personnel and field activities.

Another accomplishment was the increased role of graduate students. Since graduate students are supported by Project funds in all but one state, the number of trained professionals available regionally has been increased. These students, many with previous experience as ABE teachers, supplemented institutional efforts in the states. They have helped in the planning and evaluation of in-service programs, staffed institutes, conducted field surveys for local programs, and participated in regional seminars.

During the first year of Project activity, 7,800 teachers and coordinators participated in institution-based courses, institutes, and seminars. Over one-third (2,763) took the credit courses or attended the two-week summer institutes.

All of these training experiences were jointly planned by the institutional staff, state department of education personnel, and local program representatives. These planning efforts are further evidence of a continuing dialogue between ABE professional staffs. Individual courses and degree programs thus developed, hopefully, will respond to the training needs of local teachers, coordinators, and administrators.

Also growing out of these cooperative discussions are plans for systematic in-service training. Much planning remains to be done; the region, however, has made significant strides by expanding the number and nature of training experiences available on a regular basis. Workshops, seminars, and institutes have gone beyond orienting teachers to problems of the adult learner and are now focusing on specific

techniques for teaching adults reading, communication skills, computation skills, and social science. Continuity is evident in these in-service activities, and some realization of the necessity for variety and sequence in and evaluation of these experiences has developed.

The two-week summer institute program is actually the base for the in-service training activities within each of the six participating states. Seven of these institutes were held during the summer of 1969, with 429 persons attending. Programs to follow up these institutes were begun during the fall of 1969 and continued during the first Project year.

A total of 115 seminars and workshops were held in the region with 4,735 persons attending. (This figure represents approximately 90 percent of the local AE and ABE personnel in the participating states of the region.) These seminars and workshops dealt with specific training topics: teaching reading, student recruitment, and psychology of adult learning, for example. A secondary benefit of these meetings was the opportunity they provided for institutional, state department of education, and local program staff members to continue their dialogue on the professional development process and examine possible future activities.

There has been lesser activity in the continuing consultant phase of the Project. However, college and university staffs are now beginning to work more closely on local ABE problems with both ABE coordinators and teachers.

It is important to note that many institutional staff members are new appointees and began work at their institutions during the fall of 1969 or in January 1970. Despite their being new appointees, these staff members visited approximately 340 classes throughout the region, responded to 155 requests for assistance, visited with at least 29 supervisors, and collaborated with local personnel on 136 different problems where their expertise was useful. Since local teachers and coordinators have become aware of the availability of institutional consultants, requests for assistance have increased, though some resistance to higher education personnel coming to local areas remains; this is particularly true of graduate students sent out to do field work.

These field experiences, in addition to being valuable to the local ABE programs, have been important to the college and university faculty members who served as consultants. The contacts with local ABE personnel have caused them to focus courses and programs on the practical concerns of AE and ABE.

State Variations

The direction of and emphasis on the activities mentioned above vary among the states. These differences reflect the priorities of state department, institutional, and local program staffs in each.

Two states, Alabama and South Carolina, have made graduate credit available to many ABE personnel through off-campus classes in the major population areas of their state. In

South Carolina, teaching-team members provide much of the instruction under the supervision of staff from both institutions participating in the Project. This pattern is also becoming evident in Mississippi, though not on the same scale. In Alabama, however, the university professors provide all the instruction.

Florida, with access to the coordinating efforts of a state department of education staff member, and Florida State University (FSU) anticipate course patterns at participating institutions which will lead into FSU's doctoral program.

Georgia's program is based on an institution in each of the state's quadrants. Staff from an institution, a state department of education staff member, and a committee of local ABE directors form a quadrant planning committee. College staff or personnel from the University of Georgia are called on as needed. Graduate courses were conducted through television and additional seminar hours were available to ABE personnel; through tuition payment, credit could be secured at any of the four cooperating institutions.

Three universities in Tennessee provide on-campus courses, while the in-service program was divided among 10 geographical areas of the state. This involved seven additional institutions and made their resources available to state ABE teacher training. One-day seminars this year have emphasized techniques of individualized instruction in preparation for the introduction of learning laboratories.

Coordination for local and institutional efforts has been enhanced in Florida and South Carolina by the designation of a state department staff member with primary responsibility for staff development and project activity. Regular meetings on Project activities and planning are held in each state. Statewide as well as quadrant meetings are held in Georgia. A planning group for institutes has also been developed in Alabama.

As indicated, approaches to in-service activity have been varied. The teacher-trainer team approach used in South Carolina is being emulated in a modified pattern in Mississippi with local ABE personnel trained as subject area specialists available to programs throughout the state.

A planning group in local areas, similar to the Georgia quadrant base, is being developed in two of the five population areas of Florida. Institutional staff, a state department area supervisor, and local personnel employed by the Project form this group. They determine the in-service program, calling on university staff to supply instruction for one-day workshops; consultative help is also available from the state department. The Florida emphasis is on a large number of workshops, with selected ABE personnel attending each.

There have been frequent quadrant workshops in Georgia and several statewide coordinator conferences to insure comparability throughout the state. The area pattern of workshops, using university staff as instructors, has also begun

in Alabama and Mississippi. In both, state department staff does the planning after consulting with institutional staff.

Mississippi is also in the process of preparing local ABE teachers and coordinators to provide their own in-service instruction. This is also true in South Carolina where the state department of education supplements these local efforts with special workshops on widespread ABE problems (teaching of reading and retention and placement of students, for example).

Three states, Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi, have made extensive use of graduate students supported by Project funds. Many of these persons have experience in ABE and have contributed to, as well as learned from, this participation. Although graduate students were supported in Florida and South Carolina, their involvement has not been as extensive.

SREB-Directed Activities

Although the Project concept itself began through regional discussions, the two regionwide programs have not received maximum support and recognition from constituents in the six participating states. Both The Regional Seminar Program and The Technical Services Program have undertaken innovative steps to support professional development activities; however, there has been fairly constant resistance, which is slowly being confronted and reduced, to both of these programs.

Three regional seminars have been held to focus attention on the staff development process and its relationship

to the four program activities within each of the states. There has been discussion, definition, and to some extent, acceptance of the roles performed by each professional group in the region. Feelings of group separateness have been acknowledged and broken down to varying degrees.

The seminar program was originally intended for a minimum number of staff representing the institutions and state departments of education. Because of the orientation and problem-solving aspects of this program, the regional staff and state directors decided to make these meetings inclusive rather than exclusive; some local coordinators and teachers were invited to these sessions, expanding the base of participants and exposing individuals to a thought-provoking method of problem solving and role definition. At the first seminar and to some extent during the second, there was evident wariness on the part of each professional group toward the motives of the two others represented. The forced dialogue between these professionals has to some extent ameliorated that wariness and contributed to what appears to be the beginnings of a feeling of trust and cooperation.

The development of technical services has been purposefully limited. Those selected for support and development reflect a staff desire to underline regionwide contributions to staff development programs. Four activities were chosen for support during the first Project year. These are:

1. Cognitive Knowledge and ABE Teacher-Attitude Inventories. Evaluation devices designed to assess the extent

to which cognitive and affective objectives of teacher-training programs have been realized are notable lacks in ABE. Two instruments to remedy this need were developed and tested regionally. The first is a general achievement test that will be used in basic programs for training teachers; this test will determine each teacher's knowledge of the adult learner and focus on specific supplementary teacher-training experiences needed. The second is an attitude scale for the assessment of teacher attitudes toward teaching adults. Both of these items will be ready for use in the fall of 1970.

2. Television Committee and Film. There have been regional and national attempts to develop a film which could be used as an orientation device for new ABE teachers. Too often teachers are recruited and assigned to classes without necessary exposure to pre-service training. A film on the problems and procedures for teaching adults, especially designed for teachers without ABE experience, will be available on a state and local basis. A regional committee was formed, in cooperation with the state directors, and has developed the script and manual for this film. This package is now ready for production and will be completed in the fall of 1970.

3. Institutes for Teachers of the Blind. The facilities for training ABE teachers of the blind are a unique regional resource. Specialized equipment, techniques, and the advice of skilled staff are available. During the

summer of 1969, the Senior Citizens Center in Nashville, Tennessee, in cooperation with the Tennessee State Department of Education, trained 11 teachers to work with visually handicapped ABE students. Almost all 11 were blind or visually handicapped themselves and became successful ABE teachers in the Tennessee program. Because of its success, a second institute was planned and conducted during April 1970. Fourteen teachers of the blind, most of whom were blind or partially sighted, from each state in the region were trained at this institute with a commitment from their state and local ABE directors that programs for the visually handicapped would be supported. They returned to their states to initiate and conduct special classes for blind persons in their local districts. In addition, the techniques and equipment used for this institute have been described in reports receiving wide regional and national distribution.

4. Evaluation Seminar for Summer Institute Directors. The need for attention to the process and utilization of evaluation was evident throughout the region. Project staff involved in state and local in-service activities were particularly aware of this need, and their concern was shared by state department of education and institutional personnel. A seminar to examine principles and theories of educational program evaluation, therefore, was planned prior to the 11 major 1970 summer training institutes. While it was primarily for directors of

institutes or persons designated to conduct institute evaluations, state directors were invited to send staff members and representatives of all institutions in the Project were encouraged to attend. In addition to discussing the bases for evaluation, participants in this seminar jointly developed models for various instruments which could be used to evaluate institutes. The results of this seminar were disseminated throughout the region to assist institute directors. A follow-up session to refine further evaluation procedures is planned for the fall of 1970.

Regional Staff Activities

The Regional Project staff has assisted various state and local programs. A primary concern of the staff has been the precise identification of program-wide ABE problems: these are recognized as securing support from educational leadership, recruiting the most capable teachers, and defining relevant training experiences for teachers with different ABE backgrounds. Once problems were identified, the staff has worked with state department of education, institutional, and local program personnel to assemble resources and expertise to develop solutions. In that regard, there have been three particular areas of staff activity during the first year. These are:

1. In-Service Training. Project staff has worked with state department personnel and local program administrators in the development and implementation of in-service

training activities in each of the six states. Regional staff has been asked to provide assistance by: 1) serving on planning committees, 2) identifying resource personnel for programs, 3) making presentations at programs on topics related to teacher training and staff development, 4) explaining and interpreting the total Project and its regional concept, 5) evaluating programs with other staff, and 6) focusing attention on the interrelationship of individual training efforts to a total in-service program. The in-service activities ranged from one-day seminars to three-day workshops. The following table indicates the number of activities assisted.

State	Number of Activities Assisted
Alabama	2
Florida	2
Georgia	4
Mississippi	3
South Carolina	7
Tennessee	5

An additional staff function has been to facilitate the dialogue between personnel at the state department, institutional, and local levels. This improved communication has enhanced the coordination of activity within the states, resulting in more relevant training experiences. Indications are that during the second Project

year, in-service training will be more precisely related to the specific needs of teachers and coordinators.

2. University Short Courses and Degree Programs. Project staff also has been invited to assist universities in discussing course revisions and course and program additions. These have included noncredit, short courses in both degree and nondegree programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Discussions have also been held with institutions planning to launch master's degree programs; regional staff has helped identify and secure regional and national consultants for these discussions.

3. Summer 1970 Institute Planning and Evaluation. The most significant assistance Project staff provided was through their ongoing involvement with the planning and evaluation of the 11 summer institutes held throughout the region. Staff became members of the planning group for institutes and were available to provide suggestions on design, content, and consultants. They also conveyed information on institute activities across the region and served as a liaison for exchange of program ideas. Because of staff involvement in the evaluation seminar, they have been able to assist institute directors in devising evaluation instruments which will provide institute staffs with suggestions for changes to improve the process and content of programs.

Improved Regional Communications

All of the activities described contributed to the establishment of a dialogue on professional staff development. The Project has provided both the financial support for and the mechanism by which parties with similar concerns but different professional orientations can assemble to define their common problems and seek applicable solutions. This process actually began with the state directors of Adult Education some five years ago and has been now expanded to include every concerned group in the Southeast.

Federal interest and support for this dialogue and cooperation plays a continuing part in the Project's success. The Office of Education's regional program officer has worked with the Project staff to enhance the leadership role of the state directors. Importantly, his efforts were responsible, in part, for increased amounts of state-grant funds being applied to support summer teacher-training institutes and increased emphasis on classroom techniques and methods in seminars and workshops.

Both the regional officer and program specialists from Adult Education Division in Washington regularly attend policy meetings and regional training functions. Their presence underlines the federal commitment to the Project and expectation that nationwide lessons can be derived from this pioneering work in the Southeast.

Significant results of the regionwide dialogue are:

1. The summer institutes of 1969 which built state cohesiveness and helped to define the first year's in-service activities.
2. The development of an advisory group of state directors to work with the Project.
3. Designation of personnel from state departments with professional responsibilities for development planning and coordination of Project activity.
4. The development of planning groups for pre- and in-service training in each state.
5. The overall improvement of professional staff and institutions through constant in-state and regional associations.

It is also important that a number of graduate students have gained experience beyond their institution through their involvement with the Project. They have been provided opportunities to work in the field, as part of their course programs, and have had the opportunity to examine those experiences with their professors, aiding both their own and institutional program growth.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the genesis of the idea for a regional Project, rationale for the activities and programs chosen, and some overview of major activities and accomplishments during the first Project year.

The following chapter deals with the work of the regional evaluation panel which undertook to examine carefully Project progress during its first year. A regional progress overview prepared by the chairman of the evaluation panel follows.

Chapter II

FIRST-YEAR REGIONAL EVALUATION OF THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Prepared by:

James B. Kenney
Chairman
Evaluation Panel

Introduction

While the previous section discusses the Project's history, tasks and accomplishments, this chapter evaluates the first year of Project activity. The specific methodology for and the philosophy underlying the evaluation are described below. In addition, this section provides an overview of the current status of activities in the six-state area, using the six Project programs as the framework.

Background

Early in November 1969 the writer was asked by staff of the Staff Development Project to undertake an independent audit of the Project's first year of operation. This report reflects data and findings of a group of professionals from outside the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) environment; none of the panel members was in any way affiliated with SREB.

After discussion with Project staff on procedure, methodology of inquiry, and establishment of reliable data bases, the writer requested that a group of professionals active in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and from other disciplines be drawn together to form an evaluation team. This was done and persons from the six states as well as advisors from outside the region met in Atlanta, Georgia, for a two-day planning conference. Fundamental problems relevant to the evaluation were discussed--not always with complete agreement among the

group. The disciplines represented at this meeting were: adult education, sociology, psychology, research design and measurement, educational administration, teacher education, and vocational rehabilitation. A list of the members of the evaluation team and their home institutions is found in the appendixes.

In addition to providing a cross-section of professional expertise, the panel was also representative of participating black and white institutions in the six states of the region. This provided racial, professional, and regional balance to the effort.

Prior to the first meeting of the evaluation team, Project staff had delineated three general objectives of the Adult Basic Education (ABE) Project. These objectives reflect the philosophy of the education program and are as noted below:

1. To provide uneducated and undereducated adults access to quality continuing education.
2. To develop institutional competence for professional training and program development in Adult Education (AE).
3. To develop regional capabilities for providing programs of Adult and Continuing Education.

Further, as stated in the initial proposal to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Project effort was to focus on six programs within the region. The priority order for these six programs was determined by the fiscal ranks assigned to each program within the states and within the

region. This ranking was determined by the Project staff, after consultation with each of the six state directors.

After examination of the three general objectives and the six specific programs, the evaluation panel elected to formulate its inquiry around these. In essence, they became the criteria on which Project evaluation was based.

In order to insure adequate representation of items (questions) to which local ABE persons in each state would respond, each of the 12 evaluation panel members submitted to the panel's chairman a set of questions relating to each program. These were examined for relevance and clarity. From this original item pool of 478 questions, 141 were selected. The evaluation panel met for a second time to consider the reduced item pool and to formulate final evaluation procedures. The finished instrument contained 128 items.

The most appropriate procedure for evaluating the activities being conducted in each institution was determined to be through personal interviews with the local program coordinator, his staff, and graduate students. Accordingly, an interview schedule for visits to each of the 18 institutions of higher education, six state departments of education, and two local school districts was formulated and is as shown in the appendixes. Each visitation team contained the two panel members from each state, plus a third member from outside the state. Each person submitted independent reports.

Since some of the cooperating institutions had become operational rather late in the year, interviews at these

were delayed as long as possible. Actual on-site evaluation took place during April and May 1970.

Concurrent with the activities of the evaluation panel, assistance had been secured to generate two evaluation instruments which will provide an extended base for next year's evaluation. The first of these is "The ABE Test of Teacher Achievement" and the other, "The ABE Scale of Teacher Attitude Assessment." It was the consensus of the evaluation group that a longitudinal data base--to extend over programs for at least the duration of the Project--should be established without delay. This will enable the evaluators to describe quantitatively gains in achievement and changes in behavior on the part of ABE students and staff as a by-product. Availability of such data will make it possible to determine the impact of the six programs in terms of cost effectiveness much more concisely than is now possible in this report.

In mid-May 1970, all reports from evaluators were examined and a first draft of the report was written. The draft was examined by the principal person from each state responsible for evaluation, and the data presented were collectively discussed and analyzed. The report was then edited into its final form, which is presented following.

The Higher Education Capabilities Program

The purpose, generally stated, of this program is to enhance the capabilities of participating institutions of

higher education in building programs and extending course offerings in Adult Basic Education.

It is significant to note that Project staff from the Southern Regional Education Board, after consultation with the state directors from the participating states, established what, in their belief, was rank order program priority for the region during the initial budget planning. Their ranking follows:

Rank	Program
1	Higher Education Capabilities Program
2	Local In-Service Capability Program
3	Enhancement of State Department of Education In-Service Leadership Program
4	The Continuing Consultant Program
5	The Regional Institute Program
6	The Technical Services Program

Participating colleges, universities, and state departments of education in the six states were asked to rank the six programs as to their priority within the respective states. Table 1 shows the composite ranks of all institutions of higher education and of state departments of education. Rank "1" indicates highest priority with rank "6" being lowest, as perceived by the respondents.

It is of note that at the end of the first year of operation of the Project there was no deviation between the three groups of respondents as to rank priority. The Higher Education Capabilities Program retained rank "1" by only one point but, nevertheless, is ranked first. This concordance on priorities for the region is significant because the funding agency and the grantees are in complete agreement as to program effort.

Table 2 indicates that since the beginning of SREB involvement with state ABE efforts, 10 new curricula and 56 new courses have been added in the region, almost completely as a result of the Staff Development Project. Since only six curricula existed prior to the beginning of the program, the 10 added represent a 167 percent gain in one year, while the number of courses added in the same year represents an increase of 144 percent over the 1968-69 academic year.

Table 2

Curricula and Courses by State

State	Curricula		Courses	
	Existed	Added	Existed	Added
Alabama	0	2	2	17
Florida*	1	2	12	5
Georgia	4	3	12	10
Mississippi	1	3	4	8
South Carolina	0	0	1	10
Tennessee	0	0	8	6
Total	6	10	39	56

*Graduate programs at Florida State University are not included in this total.

Table 3 shows the number of programs by level that existed prior to the beginning of the Project and those that have been added as a result of the Project. Marginal totals for programs which existed, have been added, and are planned are shown in this table. At all levels of work 24 programs existed, 77 were added, and 52 are planned. This represents majors, minors, and offerings in substantive areas outside the field of ABE or offerings as collateral instruction to Adult Education/Adult Basic Education (AE/ABE) programs.

These course and program additions represent a 321 percent increase in the number of programs that were added as a result of the Regional Project. Since, in some instances, the Project was not operational in a few institutions until the winter or even spring academic quarters, the increase indicated above would seem to more than verify the merit of the regional effort to upgrade ABE in institutions of higher education.

Table 3
Courses and Programs by Region IV States

Level	Status	Ala.	Fla.[1]	Ga.	Miss.	S. Carolina[2]	Tenn.	Total
Courses for Undergraduate Elective Credit	Existed	1	1	0	0	1	1	4
	Added	9	0	2	0	3	0	14
	Planned	1	2	1	0	2	1	7
Courses for Graduate Elective Credit	Existed	2	0	1	4	0	7	14
	Added	12	5	6	8	10	6	47
	Planned	1	1	0	2	3	16	23
Minor for Master's	Existed	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Added	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
	Planned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Master's Degree	Existed	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
	Added	0	1	6	2	0	0	9
	Planned	1	1	0	0	1	3	6
Six-Year Specialist Certificate	Existed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Added	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
	Planned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Doctor's Degree	Existed	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Added	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
	Planned	1	0	6	0	1	2	10

1. Figures for Florida State University are not included in this total.
2. The discrepancy in figures is due to the fact that one course is counted for both undergraduate and graduate credit.

Project support has created new professional staff positions in the six states. Table 4 indicates numbers of persons and full-time positions supported.

Table 4

Faculty Supported Totally or in Part by Project Funds

State	Project Support	
	Number of Persons	Full-time Position Equivalents
Alabama	4	2 2/3
Florida	4	4
Georgia	5	1 3/4
Mississippi	4	2 1/2
South Carolina	2	2
Tennessee	4	2 2/3
Total	23	15 7/12

In some instances there appeared to be confusion about the definition of "professional staff." As there are an insufficient number of persons available who have earned doctor's degrees in AE/ABE, much of the instructional load is carried by graduate students. The majority of teaching graduate assistants are well prepared. They have, in virtually all cases, a number of years experience in the field in AE/ABE.

In the estimation of the evaluation team, the single most critical problem in Region IV is acquiring and retaining qualified persons at all levels in the field. This problem is most acute at the local ABE level. Major emphasis should be placed on recruitment during the next two years.

Table 5 depicts the number of graduate student and clerical support drawn from Project funds. In response to the question of adequacy of graduate student support, only Tennessee felt that it was inadequate; only Georgia felt clerical staff was inadequate. The equivalent of 16 graduate students and 14 1/2 secretarial/clerical persons are being supported from Project funds.

Table 5

Secondary Support Personnel

State	Graduate Student Support Adequate	Number Supported	Clerical Support Adequate	Number Supported	Graduate Students Enrolled AE/ABE Majors?
Alabama	yes	4	yes	2	yes
Florida	yes	3	yes	2 1/2	yes
Georgia	yes	3	no	1 1/2	yes
Mississippi	yes	4	yes	2	yes
S. Carolina	yes	2	yes	2	yes
Tennessee	no	0	yes	4 1/2	no
Total		16		14 1/2	

In two states graduate students are enrolled in courses leading to a minor in AE or ABE. Major programs are or soon will be available in the other four states. Both Alabama and Tennessee expect to offer major programs leading to degrees early in the academic year 1970-71.

The data reflected in Table 6 show 21 persons engaged in AE/ABE work in the six states have earned doctorates, while seven hold master's degrees. Seventeen of the 29 professional

staff persons in the six states have majors in Adult Education or Adult Basic Education. These persons work in higher educational institutions, although state department of education and local program personnel have also completed graduate-level work in this field.

Table 6

Degree Qualifications and Academic Majors of Professional Staff*

State	Doctorate	Master's	B.A. Degree	Academic Major/s
Alabama	2	2		2 Adult Education 1 Home Economics 1 Supervision and Administration
Florida	5	1		5 Adult Education 1 Specialist-Counseling
Georgia	8	1		7 Adult Education or Basic Education 1 Mathematics 1 Higher Education
Mississippi	1	2	1	1 Adult Education 2 Sociology 1 Physical Education
S. Carolina	1	1		1 Adult Education 1 Educational Administration
Tennessee	4	0		3 Adult Education 1 Educational Administration

*These totals include state department personnel involved in Project activity, as well as university staff.

Eighteen of the 29 professional staff at institutions are members of their graduate faculty. The breakdown by states is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

AE/ABE Staff Who Are Members of the Graduate Faculty

State	Number
Alabama	3
Florida	4
Georgia	3
Mississippi	2
S. Carolina	2
Tennessee	4
Total	18

In addition to the approximately 7,800 students already reached by the Project, an additional 8,205 should be assisted through both on- and off-campus courses. Table 8 indicates the figure estimates by states. The current teacher-student ratio in these courses varies from 1:12 to 1:25. Because these are graduate-level courses, enrollment is limited and maximum teacher-student interaction sought.

Table 8

Potential Student Personnel

State	On Campus	Off Campus	Total
Alabama	1,050	1,650	2,700
Florida	450	800	1,250
Georgia	185	870	1,055
Mississippi	150	*no estimate	150*
S. Carolina	130	1,500	1,630
Tennessee	120	1,300	1,420
Total	2,085	6,120	8,205

Additional university staff is required. In order to maintain a proper ratio for effective class work, approximately 22 to 30 additional qualified staff will be needed.

Table 9 summarizes the number of courses offered and students enrolled since the Project's inception. Marginal totals are presented for each type of program.

Table 9

Courses Offered and Students Enrolled

Program Type		Ala.	Fla.	Ga.	Miss.	S. C.	Tenn.	Total
On Campus	Courses	16	13	3	7	1	3	43
	Students	307	90	70	41	3	14	525
Off Campus	Courses	13	11	5	2	8	2	41
	Students	294	409	89	88	228	40	1,148
Ins.	Courses	3	21	1	3	2	2	32
	Students	177	440	131	167	90	85	1,090
Sems.	Courses	12	6	27	5	32	10	92
	Students	749	505	1,904	347	834	698	5,037
Total	Courses	44	51	36	17	43	17	208
	Students	1,527	1,444	2,194	643	1,155	837	7,800

In the first year of activity, 7,800 teachers and coordinators were reached through courses, institutes, and seminars. Over one-third of the students (2,763) participated in long-term activities, courses, and institutes. Each state's allocation was $85,030. With this limited budget, the extent of activities represents maximum fund utilization. Student guidance costs, problem consultation, graduate student support, and salaries for professional and clerical support also were drawn from this budget.

Library facilities and holdings have been expanded at the majority of the institutions of higher education. Project support, together with local funds, afforded the impetus for this expansion. Library holdings are generally adequate to support master's programs but in only two instances are sufficient for

doctoral-level programs. As noted before, the most critical institutional problems are recruiting qualified graduate students and providing support for them.

In all instances, the administration of the respective institutions has assured the coordinator of the AE/ABE program (either verbally or in writing) that the institution would assume responsibility for the program on termination of SREB support. Space, equipment, and materials provided for the program by the institutions are generally rated from above average to good.

It should be noted that the vice chancellor for instruction, Board of Regents, State of Florida, and several presidents of colleges and universities concerned have given members of the evaluation committee personal assurance of their continued support and interest in the Project.

Local In-Service Capabilities Program

Each state has a written plan for this program. In some instances plans are quite extensive and detailed, as in the case of the South Carolina plan, whereas others are simply in basic outline form.

As of May 1970, seven institutes have been held since the formation of the Project. Four hundred twenty-nine persons have attended, 52 percent of whom were black.

Table 10

Institutes, Participants, and
Percentage of Black Persons Attending

State	Number of Institutes	Number of Participants	Percentage of Blacks Attending
Alabama	1	52	58%
Florida*	0	0	0%
Georgia	1	131	49%
Mississippi	1	77	66%
S. Carolina	2	90	55%
Tennessee	2	79	40%
Total	7	429	Avg.%=52%

*Florida has decided to build training structures in local population areas instead of holding statewide institutes. When this building program is complete, it is possible that some state institutes will be held to address specific problems.

Significant strengths of the institutes were the reported high degree of interaction among participants and their apparent drive to develop a cohesive state program. In virtually all instances, the states reported that the content covered was relevant to state problems and the quality of instruction was quite good. Most respondents felt that a three-week institute was too long and that, had more prior planning time been available, the institutes could have been more highly structured and remained at a comparably effective level.

A wide range of instructional techniques was used. These ranged from forums to role-playing, and from large lectures to small panel discussions. The consensus was that the methods used were effective.

The 115 seminars and workshops held in the region during the first Project year were attended by 4,735 teachers and coordinators. This total represents approximately 90 percent of the local AE/ABE personnel in the region.

Table 11

Seminars and Participants

State	Seminars and Workshops	Participants	% Local ABE Personnel in State Attending
Alabama	15	678	84%
Florida	2	200	100%
Georgia	54	2,050	85%
Mississippi	4	405	90%
S. Carolina	23	565	90%
Tennessee	17	837	100%
Total	115	4,735	Avg.%=90%

In reporting the foregoing data, it should be noted that five of the states interpreted "seminars" as being instructional meetings of relatively long duration, e.g., two to three weeks; while "workshops" would possibly be conducted over a weekend. The figure does reflect the total number of seminars and workshops held through June 1970.

Sources of funds for these seminars and workshops are shown in Table 12. SREB is providing considerable financial assistance for activities carried on in these meetings as well as support for individuals attending.

Table 12

Program Support

State	Travel	Subsistence	Instruction/ Consultant	Facilities	Materials
Alabama[1]	SREB/SDE	SDE	SREB/Institution	Institution	SREB/SDE/Local
Ala.-SDE[2]	SREB/SDE	SDE/SREB	SREB/SDE	SREB/Institution	Institution/Local
Florida	SREB	SREB	SREB/Institution	Institution	Institution/Local
Fla.-SDE	SDE	SREB	SREB	SDE	SDE
Georgia	SDE/SREB	SDE	SREB	Institution	Institution/Local
Ga.-SDE	SDE/SREB	SDE/SREB	SREB	SDE	SREB/SDE
Mississippi	SREB	SREB	SREB	Local	SREB
Miss.-SDE	SDE	SREB	SREB	SDE	SDE
S. Carolina	SDE	SREB	SREB/SDE	SREB/Local	SDE
S. Car.-SDE	SDE	SREB	SREB/SDE	SDE	SDE
Tennessee	SDE/SREB	SDE	SREB/Institution	SREB/Local	SREB/Institution
Tenn.-SDE	None	SREB	SREB	SDE	SDE

1. First line for each state represents sources of support for institution-based activities.
2. Second line for each state represents sources of support for activities initiated by the state department of education (SDE).

57

Significant strengths of these meetings were that they provided good information about what was going on in AE/ABE in the state. The role-playing exercises were of particular value to new ABE teachers. Lack of remuneration or stipends was criticized in some instances and, in others, participants felt the lecture sessions were too long.

The Local In-Service Capabilities Program appears to be well received by the six states, and evidence exists which shows the program is having high payoff and should be continued.

Enhancement of State Department of Education In-Service Leadership Program

As a result of the Staff Development Project, all states but one have either employed or reassigned a person to be responsible for the staff development effort in the state.

There is some evidence of planned program development coordination between the respective state departments of education and representatives of institutions of higher education. The evaluation panel feels, however, that this effort is not as well coordinated as possible. Many of the "planning sessions" are arranged on a somewhat "hit-or-miss" basis and are largely informal in nature.

There is a growing movement on the part of the state departments of education for certification of ABE personnel. All of the states report that they feel certification will be accomplished within five years. As part of this process,

three of the state departments of education are currently developing evaluation criteria for AE/ABE teachers.

The Continuing Consultant Program

The two major goals of this program are to allow the college/university staffs to experience and observe problems of local ABE programs and incorporate these experiences into their teaching and to bring the expertise of college and universities into the local program.

Written plans are available for this program in all states, either as a part of the state plan or as a separate document originating from the participating institution. Degree of completeness of these plans ranges from outlines to well-defined procedures. Four kinds of activities seem to be most in evidence: 1) assisting local AE/ABE coordinators who are involved in programs funded by the state department of education, 2) supplying evaluation assistance to local coordinators, 3) supplying teaching materials to local ABE coordinators and teachers, and 4) assisting at all levels in problems of recruitment and retention of staff and students.

The number of classes and supervisors visited under The Continuing Consultant Program since the Project began is shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Classes and ABE Supervisors Visited,
Number of Requests for Assistance Received,
and Number of Problems Cooperatively Attacked

State	Number of Classes Visited	Number of Supervisors Visited	Number of Requests for Assistance	Number of Problems Cooperatively Attacked
Alabama	40 (Includes Supervisors Visited)		48	31
Florida	36 (Includes Supervisors Visited)		19	19
Georgia	47 (Includes Supervisors Visited)		16	14
Mississippi	87	7	32	32
S. Carolina	100 (Includes Supervisors Visited)		30	30
Tennessee	27	22	10	10
Total	337	29	155	136

Examples of the kinds of requests for assistance that have been received by institutions of higher education are:

1. Assist the local ABE person in planning instruction.
2. Assist and advise the state department of education in preparation of teaching materials.

3. Cooperate with colleges/universities in planning staff and student recruitment strategy.

4. Assist local ABE supervisors and teachers in community problems--particularly as they pertain to training of black enrollees in ABE.

In the majority of instances, these problems have been cooperatively attacked, with state department of education staff engaged in these cooperative efforts. Problems that have not been addressed are principally local administrative ones. These do not lend themselves to solution by university staff.

This involvement in local problems has not significantly changed the participating colleges' and universities' roles or contributions to the regional institutes. Probably the greatest effect of this involvement with local problems is through a "feedback" of actual problems into curricula as case studies are used as teaching devices. Several of the states expressed the need for released time during the day, enabling instructors to work with local programs at night. There has been some success with this approach in Mississippi.

There is some resistance to higher education personnel coming into the local areas. This is particularly true in the case of graduate assistants sent out to do field work. Local ABE and state department of education people feel that in many instances university people are not as knowledgeable as they should be about local problems. As a result they

provide "theoretical solutions" which sometimes are more harmful than helpful.

It appears there should be closer contact between the state department of education and university and college AE/ABE people. The entire program could benefit from more state department of education involvement with institution programs.

Regional Seminar Program

Written plans for this program do exist, either as a part of the state plan or as a separate document. In five states, one or more institutions within the state had not seen these plans. All states except Mississippi reported that the three regional seminars were adequate for their purposes. None of the agencies in Mississippi felt that the seminars were adequate.

At least one institution of higher education in each state said they would initiate follow-up meetings. It was generally decided among each group of colleges within a state which institution would assume the responsibility for conferences. It was the opinion of the staffs that more detailed planning could be accomplished. Mississippi was the only state that did not plan to conduct follow-up meetings.

Table 14

Adequacy of Regional Seminars,
Follow-Up Meetings at State and or University Level

State	Total Number of Responses*	Regional Seminars Adequate for Your Purposes		Follow-Up Meeting at State Level		Follow-Up Meeting at University/ College Level	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Alabama	3	3		3		3	
Florida	4	4		4		4	
Georgia	5	4	1	4	1	4	1
Mississippi	3		3	1	2	1	2
S. Carolina	3	3		3		3	
Tennessee	4	2	2		4	1	3

*The total in each state includes the state department of education and each participating institution.

The most serious objections to the regional seminars in order of their occurrence were: 1) out-of-region consultants were not sufficiently conversant with Region IV problems, 2) some topics presented in the seminars were not relevant, and 3) expectations of the programs were not covered in sufficient depth.

The strengths of the regional seminars were: 1) a breaking down of a feeling of isolation within separate states, and 2) the opportunity for state department of education staff, university personnel, and local ABE staff to exchange ideas and solidify program plans.

Discussion of funding procedures and the commonality of regional problems was apparently of great benefit to virtually all participants. It appears, however, that the state directors were unwilling to fully participate in this program,

because of a desire to maintain the integrity and individuality of their own programs.

All states with the exception of South Carolina felt that the training of persons for local leadership roles was a problem of regional significance. Other regional problems identified were: 1) a feeling by university/college people that the administration may only be giving "lip service" to a real commitment to AE/ABE in spite of the verbal and written assurance they have received, 2) the lack of a body of research literature in the field, 3) the extreme difficulty experienced in recruiting and retaining experienced AE/ABE professional persons, and 4) the constant problem of client retention.

Many reactions to The Regional Seminar Program were quite positive; some of these were mentioned earlier. In addition, the value of university, state department of education, and local ABE persons sitting down together, formulating plans for the future of their state programs, and discussing dollar commitments with SREB was noted. A better understanding of college/university problems and state and local problems was another positive result of the seminars.

The Technical Services Program

If one phrase were to be selected to describe this program, it would be "lack of communication and misunderstanding." The state departments of education have used these services to a very limited extent and institutions of higher education, with the exception of University of Georgia, not at all.

The evaluation panel believes this program has great potential, but user agencies simply do not understand the services available to them through it. Project staff should immediately undertake an education and information program, beyond what they have already done, to include all AE/ABE levels within the six states.

Possibly the most significant product to come out of The Technical Services Program is a series of two tests being developed at the University of Georgia.

A definite lack in training teachers of the disadvantaged adult is a series of evaluation devices to assess the attainment of various cognitive and affective objectives of those training programs. There was a need for instruments that could be used on a regional basis to assess program outcomes in terms of trainee performance. Two types of instruments were considered of most immediate benefit: 1) a general achievement test, representing the content of basic courses, that could be used in basic programs for training teachers of the disadvantaged adult, and 2) an attitude scale for the assessment of trainee attitudes toward a number of components important to the process of teaching the disadvantaged adult.

Out-of-region consultants used under this program were generally not sufficiently conversant with local problems to be of great help. Consultants from out of state but within the region were considered to be adequate to very adequate. The evaluation panel believes, however, that this resource

was not used sufficiently, particularly by college/university ABE professional staff.

The six states generally felt that the problems encountered to date requiring technical services could be dealt with by persons available in the state. This is probably true; however, the evaluation panel believes that sometimes a person not involved in local affairs can bring fresh perspective to bear on a problem and can more readily suggest solutions of higher quality than otherwise would be forthcoming.

The Regional Office

The consensus in the six states was that the Project staff had been most helpful. It is difficult to single out one area in which they have been particularly helpful, since their work is so diverse. Several state reports noted that the staff had been of particular value in planning and implementing state programs. There was expressed need for assistance from the regional office in identifying and securing staff personnel to assist the separate states to develop specialized programs for ABE in such areas as reading.

Contact by Project staff has apparently been frequent and helpful at the state department of education level but less frequent with colleges and universities. More visits to the latter were indicated.

Additional services which would be desirable from the regional office are: 1) assistance in evaluating and plan-

ning conferences and institutes, and 2) the addition to the SREB staff of curriculum specialists in communications skills and reading.

There was general appreciation of staff ability to adjust budget items to meet specific, often unforeseen needs.

Conclusion

Considering the scope of the undertaking, the geographical area included, and the late start of some local programs, the image of the Staff Development Project and staff is quite favorable. The Project, hopefully, can be broadened to include at least eight additional colleges and universities. It has, in the first year of operation, demonstrated its value by providing the cohesive force that has moved universities and colleges toward implementing strong Adult Basic Education programs within the states. SREB has also provided opportunity for frequent contact among ABE persons from different states. This may be the most important outcome of the Project. It really does not lend itself to measurement in the classic sense, but the establishment of a feeling of "oneness" and a realization of the probable success of a regional effort in ABE could well be the most productive elements of this undertaking.

Chapter III

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Though progress has been made in all six programs and in each of the participating states, much remains to be accomplished. This chapter describes activities which will be undertaken during the second year of the Project by regional professional staff and individuals within state departments, institutions of higher education, and local programs.

The scope of Project activity the second year will be expanded through the inclusion of Kentucky and North Carolina. They have been added to the original six through the expansion of Department of Health, Education and Welfare Region IV. Three institutions of higher education in each state will participate, including two (Morehead State University in Kentucky and North Carolina State University) with demonstrated expertise in Adult Education. Their resources will be applied, along with others in the region, to activities and needs described here.

One unique but undeveloped facet of the Project is its emphasis on relating institutional courses and programs to local Adult Basic Education (ABE) needs. Instructional staff and graduate students spend nearly one-third of their time in the field working with teachers and supervisors, addressing problems, and seeking solutions that can be applied immediately. The process for establishing what are the actual teacher-training and program-development needs is irregular at best. Mechanisms must be defined to enable all concerned

planners to indicate specific training needs and the sorts of experiences that best meet those needs.

In-service training has progressed to include more technical subjects related to classroom operation and topics to be presented to adults. Means for building upon teacher experience with adults and examining how rapport is established have yet to be adequately approached. In particular, more attention will be paid to the use of individualized instruction in ABE classes. "How to" knowledge is at a low level, as is teacher willingness to employ this technique.

These training experiences for teachers should employ the same methods that teachers best use with adult students. Too often, seminars and workshops fail to achieve maximum participant involvement, relying on traditional practice in teacher education, the lecture and guided discussions.

The effectiveness of in-service experiences has been limited because there is incomplete knowledge of the ABE teacher population, their needs and levels of ability. Some research has been done to develop a profile of this group; much more is needed and will be undertaken, along with complementary efforts to examine the nature and structure of ABE programs in rural and urban areas.

Individual teachers, coordinators, and state officials have underlined the value derived from continuing contact with colleges and universities in the region. They indicate benefits from this association; however, they continue to discuss an imagined gap between "theoreticians" and "practitioners."

Experiences in this region have shown college and university personnel to be different from the image of detached and abstract academicians. Nonetheless, the awe state department staff and local coordinators have of higher education and their wariness of abstract and seemingly irrelevant courses remain factors to be discussed more openly and candidly.

More local teachers and coordinators should be consulted when institutional courses and in-service programs are planned. Involvement of these and other professional staff should enable all ABE to define more clearly their roles and training needs and to address the roots of ABE problems; the current tendency is to concentrate on recognizable symptoms of program limitation, such as inabilities in recruitment and retention of students. The question of "education for what?" merits consideration, enabling professional persons to examine and evaluate the relevance of commonly accepted motivations for ABE students.

The dialogue begun among the state department, institutional, and local program personnel must more directly focus on the complementary roles each group plays. Some very limited steps have been taken at regional seminars and state meetings to define these roles and analyze the competencies each professional group should have to perform its job adequately.

Although the leadership role of state departments of education staff has been enhanced, the scope and legitimacy of their responsibilities must be made clearer in the region. Their role in the establishment of statewide planning groups should be emphasized and encouraged. These groups have taken

root in some states, but are not yet fully recognized as essential parts of any state program.

A related topic is the potentially unique role of black expertise in the region. Black institutional and local program personnel have abilities and insights which have not been fully utilized; this is equally true of those in related educational fields, social service organizations, business, and industry.

There is evidence that six predominantly black institutions have contributed to Project accomplishments this first year. Black leadership is decidedly lacking in other crucial areas, such as on state department of education staffs and as ABE program coordinators and supervisors. There are black personnel with proven experience and demonstrated sensitivity to ABE students who should be considered for administrative and program development positions. Efforts should be made to identify potential leadership among the many black ABE teacher and provide them with the training to assume greater responsibilities in ABE. This training could be a useful combination of academic and field experience that many of these persons now lack.

The identification of professional staff and their respon sibilities is one facet of the planning process. All Project goals and activities underline a belief that sequential progra and professional growth will be facilitated through comprehensive plans for individual and group development. The concept and importance of planning have not been sufficiently accepted

by all of the states. There is a tendency to consider activities and unrelated components as a plan and a resultant failure to account for a progressive sequence of varied experiences which are parts of complete plans for professional staff improvement.

Regional seminars during the second year will focus on the planning process, especially as it relates to the responsibilities of each professional group. The large orientation and initial planning session of the first year will give way to in-depth studies that should evolve into state and region-wide programs for training professionals in ABE.

The planning process should examine how to expand necessary ties with educational leadership. In some of the states only minimal efforts have been made to develop relationships and understanding between state department ABE staffs and the local superintendents of education. One state department has moved ahead by meeting all school superintendents to discuss ABE concerns. Other state departments have planned to attend regular superintendent meetings to explain their programs. These steps are to be encouraged. Since much of ABE in the region exists through public education facilities, increased efforts should be made to involve local superintendents and gain their support for ABE programs.

Through the planning process two important additional activities could be initiated. Critical evaluation of activities by state department, institution, and local staffs should be made. If program objectives are clearly detailed, evalua-

tion instruments can be developed to assess progress toward those objectives. These instruments should examine program content, teaching methods, facilities and materials, and, importantly, relationships between administrators and teachers, among teachers, and between staff and students. Too often evaluation is viewed as a threat in the hands of external and unsympathetic persons. Instead, it should be understood and used as a technique for improvement of programs.

Project evaluation techniques the second year will underline the belief in evaluation for program improvement. A continuous evaluation of state-based and regionwide programs will be made, coordinated with all ABE activities. This will be integrated with, rather than detached from, other aspects of the Project.

A second activity could stem from this evaluation process it is improving the mechanisms by which individuals are selected to become ABE teachers and coordinators. There is a great need for specific criteria to identify those individuals most able to work with adults. Too often the selection process is inadequate, and individuals unsuited for this work are chosen.

The ABE personnel of the region feel that much has been accomplished in the area of staff development during this firs year of Project activity. It is realized, though, that both quality and specificity must be added in many areas to increas the immediate and long-range impact of this effort in Adult Basic Education. The next two years of the Project should,

hopefully, provide the time and impetus needed to build on the framework already established for a comprehensive program of staff development.

APPENDIXES

PROJECT STAFF

Dr. William R. O'Connell
Director
Special Programs
Southern Regional Education Board

Dr. Edward T. Brown
Project Director
Adult Basic Education

Dr. Charles E. Kozoll
Associate Project Director
Adult Basic Education

Dr. Preston E. Torrence
Associate Project Director
Adult Basic Education

OFFICE OF EDUCATION
PROGRAM OFFICERS

Mr. Eugene Sullivan
Program Specialist
Adult Education Branch
Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Mr. William Phillips
Program Officer, Region IV
Adult Education
Office of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Alabama

Mr. Norman O. Parker
Director, Adult Basic Education

Florida

Mr. James H. Fling
Director, Adult and Veteran Education

Georgia

Mrs. Catherine Kirkland
Coordinator, Adult Education

Mississippi

Mr. J. C. Baddley
Supervisor of Adult Education

South Carolina

Mr. J. K. East
Director, Office of Adult Education

Tennessee

Mr. Charles F. Kerr
Coordinator of Adult Education

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS,
STAFF, AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Alabama

Alabama State University:

Montgomery, Alabama

Dr. Marshall Morrison
(Faculty)
Mrs. Doris Sanders
(Faculty)

Miss Eugenia James
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Robert Laster
(Graduate Student)

Auburn University:

Auburn, Alabama

Dr. Harry Frank
(Faculty)
Mr. William C. Clayton
(Faculty)

Mr. Edgar Byers
(Graduate Student)
Miss Mary Hancock
(Graduate Student)
Mr. James Mason
(Graduate Student)

Florida

Florida A & M University:

Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Arthur Madry
(Faculty)
Mr. N. Edgar Fenn
(Faculty)

Miss Lossie Daniels
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Ozell Green
(Graduate Student)

University of South Florida:

Tampa, Florida

Dr. Robert Palmer
(Faculty)

Florida Atlantic University:

Boca Raton, Florida

Dr. Robert Weigman, Dean
(School of Education)
Dr. Harvey Myers, Chairman
(Department of Education)

Georgia

Albany State College:

Albany, Georgia

Mr. Robert L. Marshall
(Faculty)

Georgia Southern College:

Statesboro, Georgia

Dr. Hilton T. Bonniwell
(Faculty)
Mr. Brent Halverson
(Faculty)

West Georgia College:

Carrollton, Georgia

Dr. Donald Adams
(Faculty)
Dr. Collus Johnson
(Faculty)

University of Georgia:

Athens, Georgia

Dr. Curtis Ulmer
(Faculty)
Mr. Frank Commander
(Faculty)

Miss Jacquelyn Brown
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Donald J. Kaple
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Don Bender
(Graduate Student)

Mississippi

Jackson State College:

Jackson, Mississippi

Mrs. Katherine J. Mosley
(Faculty)
Mrs. Lillian Lane
(Faculty)

Mrs. Rosa King
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Nathaniel Owens
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Solomon Johnson
(Staff)

Mississippi State University:

Starkville, Mississippi

Dr. Don F. Seaman
(Faculty)

Mr. James R. Phillips
(Graduate Student)
Mr. Edgar Martin
(Graduate Student)

South Carolina

South Carolina State College:

Orangeburg, South Carolina

Mr. Allen Code
(Faculty)

Mrs. Dorothy Jarvis
(Graduate Student)

University of South Carolina:

Columbia, South Carolina

Dr. Robert Snyder
(Faculty)

Miss Judy Smith
(Graduate Student)

Tennessee

Memphis State University:

Memphis, Tennessee

Dr. Donnie Dutton
(Faculty)

Tennessee State University:

Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. James E. Farrell
(Faculty)
Dr. Mildred Hurley
(Faculty)

University of Tennessee at Knoxville:

Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. John M. Peters
(Faculty)

REGIONAL SEMINAR CONSULTANTS

Dr. Paul H. Sheats
Professor of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Robert A. Luke, Director
Division of Adult Education
Services
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Edgar M. Easley
Director of ABE Institute
University Extension
University of California
Los Angeles, California

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Mr. James R. Dorland
Executive Secretary
NAPCAE
Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Elaine Parker, Director
The Adult Basic Education
Training Institute for
Teachers of Blind and
Visually Limited Adults
Senior Citizens Center
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Robert Rentz
Consultant
Test Instrument Development
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

EVALUATION PANEL

Alabama	
Auburn University	Dr. Lloyd Robison
Alabama State College	Dr. Dev Bajaj
Florida	
Florida State University	Dr. Andrew Hendrickson
Florida A & M	Dr. Charles U. Smith
Georgia	
University of Georgia	Dr. James B. Kenney
University of Georgia	Dr. John D. Blakeman
Mississippi	
Mississippi State University	Dr. Emmett T. Kohler
Jackson State College	Dr. John A. Hall
South Carolina	
University of South Carolina	Mr. Charles Statler
South Carolina State	Mrs. Margaret Howie
Tennessee	
Middle Tennessee State	Dr. Ralph E. White
Tennessee State University	Dr. Pearl Gunter
Out of Region	
University of Wisconsin	Dr. Wilson Thiede

INTERVIEW ASSIGNMENTS

ALABAMA

State Department of Education	Bajaj	Robison	Statler
Alabama State University	Bajaj	Robison	Statler
Auburn University	Bajaj	Robison	Statler

FLORIDA

State Department of Education	Hendrickson	Smith	Bajaj
Florida A & M University	Hendrickson	Smith	Bajaj
University of South Florida Hillsborough County	Hendrickson	Hall	
Florida Atlantic University Broward County	Hendrickson	Hall	

GEORGIA

State Department of Education	Blakeman	Gunter	
Albany State College	Blakeman	Robison	
Georgia Southern College	Blakeman	Robison	
West Georgia College	Blakeman	Gunter	
University of Georgia	Blakeman	Howie	

MISSISSIPPI

State Department of Education	Kohler	Bajaj	Hall
Jackson State College	Kohler	Bajaj	Hall
Mississippi State University	Kohler	Bajaj	Hall

SOUTH CAROLINA

State Department of Education	Statler	Kohler	Howie
South Carolina State College	Statler	Kohler	Howie
University of South Carolina	Statler	Kohler	Howie

TENNESSEE

State Department of Education	White	Gunter	
Tennessee State University	White	Gunter	
Memphis State University	White	Kohler	
University of Tennessee (Knoxville)	White	Gunter	Blakeman

The first person listed is responsible for making scheduling arrangements. He is also responsible for writing state report

SREB
REGION IV'S ADULT BASIC EDUCATION
PROJECT FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS
OF THE PROJECT IN THE SIX PARTICIPATING STATES

It is recognized that all programs, at this stage of development, may not yet be functionally operative in each state and that many institutions only recently have become active. Thus, each evaluation will be in terms of the priorities established by the state plan, the length of time an institution has been active with the Project, and the prospect that regional priorities will be met during the three years of the Project.

Project Objectives

The Project is regional in nature. The proposal under which the Project was funded established three general objectives. These were:

1. To provide to uneducated and undereducated adults access to quality Continuing Education.

2. To develop institutional competence for professional training and program development in Adult Education.

3. To develop regional capabilities for providing programs of Adult and Continuing Education.

Programs

These objectives were to be pursued through the following six (6) programs. Each of these programs was given a regional rank order of priority through activities of the Project office. These priorities were not necessarily those of the separate states. Please rank the programs below in the rank order of priority you judge them to be in your state. (1=highest; 6=lowest).

_____ Higher Education Capabilities Program

_____ Local In-Service Capability Program

_____ Enhancement of State Department of Education In-Service Leadership Program

_____ The Continuing Consultant Program

_____ The Regional Institute Program

_____ The Technical Services Program

Basic Information

Institution: _____

Names of Staff:

Date of Project Initiation: _____

Deviation or Exception, if any:

Budget Allocations

	Higher Education Capabilities	Local Capabilities	Enhance SDE	Continuing Consultant
Professional staff				
Graduate student				
Secretarial				
Consultant				
Travel				
Communications				
Supplies				
Equipment Office				
Equipment Educational				
Seminars, etc.				

Institution: _____

SDE respond to Item F only
College/University respond to all others

I. Higher Education Capabilities Program

The purpose of this program is to establish or enhance the capabilities of selected institutions of higher education to provide pre-service and in-service training to Adult Education personnel--i.e., to develop in-service programs, undergraduate and graduate courses, and degree programs in Adult Education.

A. Curriculum

1. How many AE/ABE curricula and courses existed prior to this Project? How many have been added since joining the Project?

	Existed	Added
Curricula		
Courses		

2. What programs existed prior to the Project? Which have been added or will be added as a result of the Project?

	Existed	Added	Planned
Undergraduate courses			
Graduate courses			
Minor for Master's			
Master's Degree			
Six-year program			
Doctor's Degree			

(a) Have you requested any courses which have been rejected? yes___ no___ If no, what was the cause for rejection?

B. Staff

1. How many new professional staff positions are provided by Project funds?

2. Has secondary support personnel (graduate student and secretarial) been adequate to accomplish Project activities?

   (a) graduate student support yes___ no___
   (How many? ___)

   (b) clerical, stenographic yes___ no___
   (How many? ___)

   (c) Are the graduate students enrolled in AE as a major ___, minor ___, in courses only ___? If not a major, what is the area of their degree?

3. How qualified in AE/ABE are the professional staff?

   Degrees _____

   Major-Minor _____

   Lesser Preparation_____

   Applicable Experience _____

4. What difficulties have been experienced in securing qualified staff?

   Professional Staff

   Graduate Students

5. How many of the professional staff are members of the graduate faculty? _____

C. Students

1. What is your estimate of the potential student clientele?

   on-campus _____ off-campus or extension _____

2. Are large areas of the state or large segments of the student population not now being served?

   areas: yes ___ no ___ students: yes ___ no ___

   If not, why?

3. To what degree have you had difficulty in recruiting students?

4. How many courses have been offered and how many students have been enrolled since the Project began?

	Courses	Students
on-campus		
off-campus		
institutes		
seminars		

D. Facilities

1. Have library facilities in AE/ABE been increased since the Project began? yes ___ no ___ If yes, were they added

   at Project expense: yes ___ no ___

   with institutional support: yes ___ no ___

   Are they adequate to support advanced degrees? yes ___ no ___

2. Have physical facilities and equipment for Project activities been increased since the Project began? yes ___ no ___. If yes, were they added

   through Project support: yes ___ no ___

   through institutional support: yes ___ no ___

   Are they adequate? yes ___ no ___

E. Acceptance of the Program

1. Has the administration of your college/university expressed a willingness to support the ABE program at the termination of this Project? yes___ no ___

   What evidence do you have? If not, what reasons are there?

2. What has the college/university contributed to the Project in the areas of:

   (a) curriculum

   (b) staff

   (c) student recruitment assistance

   (d) physical facilities

3. Has the AE program and the Project been adequately communicated or publicized within the institution?

   to the administration: yes ___ no ___

   to the faculty: yes ___ no ___

   to the students: yes ___ no ___

   What means have been most effective?

F. (SDE only) Has each institution made the contributions to teacher training that are provided for in the state plan and which could reasonably be expected during the first year? (Respond for each institution separately.) yes ___ no ___

   (a) What have been the major contributions?

   (b) What contributions need to be added as capability develops?

II. Local In-Service Capabilities Program

The purpose of this program is to develop a local capability to provide in-service training to local ABE program personnel. It also included the "short-range" objective of up-grading some of the ABE teachers through summer institute experiences and follow-up activity to these institutes so as to increase their impact.

A. Has a written plan for this program been developed for your state? yes ___ no ___

   1. If a plan has been developed, what are the major components?

   2. Which components in "1" above have been implemented?

3. To what degree have institutions in your state engaged in or cooperated with each other and the SDE in setting up institutes, workshops, etc.?

B. Institutes (short-range objective)

1. Number of institutes _____ Number of participants _____ Number of minority race members _____

2. Is there any evidence of sequential program content from one institute to the next planned institute? yes ___ no ___ If yes, please cite.

3. Is there any evidence of sequential program content from the institute(s) to the area seminars or workshops? yes ___ no ___ If yes, please cite.

4. Evaluation:

(a) Were the institutes evaluated? yes ___ no ___ If yes, by whom?

(b) What were the significant strengths?

(c) What were the significant weaknesses?

(d) What were the instructional methods?

(e) Were the instructional methods adequate? yes ___ no ___

5. How and by whom were the participants selected?

6. Were these the best choices? If not, how would you change the procedure?

C. Area Seminars, Workshops, and Conferences

1. Number of seminars _____; Number of participants _____; Percent of local ABE personnel attending _____; Percent of local ABE personnel attending more than one seminar _____.

2. Evaluation:

(a) Were these area meetings evaluated? yes ___ no ___ If yes, by whom?

(b) What were their significant strengths?

(c) What were their significant weaknesses?

(d) What were the instructional methods? Were they adequate? yes ___ no ___

(e) How were the participants notified or invited to attend?

(f) What were the sources of funds or other support that were provided the participants? Identify their source (local, college/university, state, regular state ABE grant, Project, etc.)

Travel _____

Subsistence _____

Salary or stipend _____

Instruction or consultant services _____

Facilities or equipment _____

Materials _____

III. Enhancement of SDE In-Service Leadership Program

The purpose of this program is to augment the state staff or in other ways increase its skill and capabilities to provide in-service leadership for local programs as well as for college programs. It is particularly important that they coordinate the college efforts into a statewide program

A. Do you have written plans at the state level to implement this program? yes ___ no ___. If not, are they included in your state plan for the Project? yes ___ no ___

1. Have additional items been added to your original plans for enhancing the SDE role as a result of the regional institutes or other Project activities? yes ___ no ___. If yes, cite them.

B. What new SDE staff have been engaged or what regular staff have been reassigned to the ABE activities as a result of the SREB Project?

C. Is there evidence of planned coordination of program development between SDE personnel and representatives of institutions of higher education? yes ___ no ___

1. If the answer to "C" above is yes, list examples.

2. If the answer to "C" above is no, in your opinion, why does a lack of coordination exist?

D. What types of SDE and university meetings have been held for the purpose of coordinating statewide efforts in ABE?

1. How many meetings of this type have been held since the beginning of the Project? _____

E. As a result of this Project, what steps have been taken to get certification standards for teachers of ABE?

F. (University staff only) How many meetings concerned with staff development activities has the SDE staff development person held with your staff? _____

1. How many meetings on this subject have been held which included the other institutions in the state participating in the Project?

2. How many other contacts has the SDE staff development person had with individual AE staff at your institution? _____

IV. The Continuing Consultant Program

This program has two complementary purposes: 1) to allow the college staff to experience and study the problems and difficulties of the local ABE programs so that they can bring this information into the college curriculum and 2) to deliver the college expertise into the local ABE program for the improvement of ABE instruction and supporting services.

A. Do you have written plans to implement this program? yes ___ no ___

B. What activities are under way under this program?

1. How many classes or ABE supervisors have been visited? _____

2. How many requests for assistance to help solve local problems have been received from local program personnel? _____

3. How many of the above problems have been cooperatively attacked? _____

4. List any other problems encountered but not attacked.

C. How have you or your staff gained access to local program activity?

E. Has this involvement in local programs affected the curriculum course content, or instructional patterns at your institution? yes ___ no ___ If yes, how?

F. Has this involvement in local programs changed your role or contribution to the regional institute? yes ___ no ___ If yes, how?

G. Has your involvement in local programs produced any problems for you with the institution, your colleagues, or campus students? yes ___ no ___ If yes, what were they?

H. (SDE only) Are the professional staff and graduate students sufficiently active in this program? yes ___ no ___

1. What problems are they helping solve? List.

2. Are their services welcomed by local ABE program personnel? yes ___ no ___

3. Have they created any problems for you? yes ___ no ___ If yes, cite them.

4. What suggestions do you have for improving this program in your state?

V. Regional Institute Program

This program will provide study and discussion opportunity to the college and state department of education Adult Education staffs, and to others who can contribute to the development of the Project.

A. Have you seen written plans for implementing this program? yes ___ no ___

B. Are the three planned regional institutes adequate for your purposes? yes ___ no ___ Will these be supplemented or followed up by state sessions? yes ___ no ___ By college/university sessions? yes ___ no ___

1. What topics of the regional institutes have been valuable?

2. Do other topics need to be included? yes ___ no ___ If yes, list them.

C. Two regional institutes have already been held. What values did you receive from the institutes that you attended relative to:

1. A clearer understanding of the total Project plan?

2. Breakdown of a feeling of separate state (or institution) operation and becoming part of a regional effort for staff development?

3. Which of your needs have been identified to be regional in the discussion sessions of the regional institutes?

4. (SDE only) Have you assigned the "staff development responsibility" to a staff member? yes ___ no ___ Full-time ___ Part-time ___ If part-time, what are his other responsibilities?

5. (SDE only) Do you now have a written plan for staff development? yes ___ no ___

VI. The Technical Services Program

This program will bring technical expertise from anywhere in the country to help solve regional and local problems in the higher education activities of training ABE personnel, state department of education leadership role, and in local ABE programs as they are concerned with staff development.

A. To what extent have you had advantage from, or requested services from this program? none ____ some ___ much ___.

1. How useful have you found these to be?

Bibliography on Poverty for ABE Teachers
none ___ some ___ very ___

Test of ABE Conceptual Knowledge
none ___ some ___ very ___

Test of ABE Teacher Attitude
none ___ some ___ very ___

B. Have you encountered any problems which called for technical services that could not be obtained locally? yes ___ no ___

1. If yes, list them.

C. How adequate were the consultants from outside your state with whom you have had contact? Inadequate ___ Somewhat adequate ___ Very adequate ___

D. How valuable to you have the suggestions from out-of-state consultants been for solutions to your problems? No value ___ Some value ___ Very valuable ___

VII. The Regional Facility

A. Staff

1. Have the services from the Project staff been adequate? yes ___ no ___

(a) Which services have been most helpful?

(b) What additional services are desirable?

2. Has the Project staff helped you to implement your Project-supported activities? yes ___ no ___ If no, what help could you use?

B. Consultants

1. Have the consultants provided by the Project been helpful to your progress? yes ___ no ___

(a) How many contacts with consultants have you had? _____

(b) Were they the kind of consultants you needed? yes ___ no ___

2. Have the consultants been helpful to you in your efforts to achieve the overall goals of the Project? yes ___ no ___

VIII. (For the Interviewer only) Impressions from Data-Gathering Experience

A. Does the staff you met seem to be enthusiastic and have commitment to the Project?

TELEVISION PRODUCTION COMMITTEE

Alabama

Mr. Leon L. Hornsby
Adult Education Division
State Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama

Mrs. Malissa J. Burton
High School Equivalency Program
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Mrs. Voncile T. Lackey
Adult Basic Education
Mobile Public Schools
Mobile, Alabama

Florida

Mrs. Jeanne D. Brock
Adult Education Section
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Mr. N. Edgar Fenn
School of Education
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, Florida

Mr. Lowell E. Ledford
State Department of Education ETV
Tallahassee, Florida

Georgia

Mr. Joe Fuller
Coordinator
Adult Education
Atlanta Fulton Schools

Mr. John Haney
Georgia ETV Network
Atlanta, Georgia

Mr. Charles Bowen
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Kentucky

Mr. Robert Pike
Division of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky

Mr. Charles Anderson
Division of Radio-TV Services
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Mr. William Goldwair
Louisville, Kentucky

Mississippi

Mr. Wiley Wood, Supervisor
Adult Basic Education
Itawamba Vo-Tech Education Center
Tupelo, Mississippi

Mr. C. L. Hill
State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi

North Carolina

Dr. Emily Quinn
Department of Adult Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Mr. Charles A. Barrett
Director
Adult Education Division
Department of Community Colleges
Raleigh, North Carolina

South Carolina

Mr. Robert Elton
South Carolina ETV
Columbia, South Carolina

South Carolina (Continued)

Mr. Frank Hardin
Office of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina

Mr. James B. Faulk
Charleston, South Carolina

Tennessee

Mr. Billy Glover
Division of Adult Education
State Department of Education
Jackson, Tennessee

Mr. Walter R. Harbison
Adult Education
Knox County Board of Education
Knoxville, Tennessee

Mr. Morris Busby
Memphis Board of Education
Memphis, Tennessee

REGIONAL PROJECT PUBLICATIONS

1969-70

EVALUATION SEMINAR REPORT
Summary of Meetings and Model
Instruments Developed, June 5-6,
Atlanta, Georgia

JOINT CONFERENCE REPORT
Second Annual Region IV
Conference on Adult Education

Second Regional Institute
Southeastern Region
Adult Basic Education
Staff Development Project

Report of Meeting, Daytona Beach, Florida
February 14-18, 1970

POVERTY: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
Prepared by the University of Georgia
Department of Adult Education

PROFESSIONAL PAPERS
Presented at Third Regional Seminar
Southeastern Region
Adult Basic Education
Staff Development Project

New Orleans, Louisiana
May 6-9, 1970

SEMINAR REPORT
Third Regional Seminar
Southeastern Region
Adult Basic Education
Staff Development Project

New Orleans, Louisiana
May 6-9, 1970

SPECIAL REPORT -- Adult Basic Education Project
June 1, 1969 -- October 30, 1969

A Regional Approach for Improvement of Adult Basic
Education in HEW Region IV States

Submitted to the Office of Education

TRAINING INSTITUTE REPORTS

Training Institute for Teachers of Blind and Visually Limited Adults for Adult Basic Education Classes
Senior Citizens Center
Nashville, Tennessee
September 1969

The Adult Basic Education Training Institute for Teachers of Blind and Visually Limited Adults
Senior Citizens Center
Nashville, Tennessee
May 1970

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUN 12 1972
on Adult Education